

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/679,043	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FOOS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Josiah Cocks	<b>Art Unit</b> 3749	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) Josiah Cocks (USPTO).

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Tait Swanson (applicant's representative).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 4 September 2007
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Proposed rejection, not currently of record to claims 61-66 on the basis of the prior art of record U.S. Patent No. 2,709,446 to Miller and U.S. Patent No. 2,666,479 to Clinton*

Claims discussed:

61-66

Prior art documents discussed:

*Miller and Clinton*
**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
**JOSIAH C. COCKS**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

## Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner contacted applicant's representative to discuss a proposed rejection to claims 61-66. The examiner indicated that the body and valve described in this claim read on the valve structure shown in Miller. The examiner admitted that the device of Miller was not a torch and thus did not anticipate applicant's recitation of a system comprising a torch comprising the body and valve recited in applicant's claim 61. However, after further consideration the examiner proposed that a rejection of claims 61-66 would be proper on the basis of the substitution of the valve of Miller into the torch of Clinton would be a matter of combining the prior art to yield the predictable result of a torch having a valve as recited in claims 61-66. The examiner proposed incorporating the limitations of claim 67 into claim 61 to result in a system comprising a torch having a body, valve and valve passage structurally distinct from the prior art of record and thus overcome an obvious type rejection to claims 61-66. Applicant's representative agreed to an examiner's amendment incorporating the limitations of claim 67 into claim 61 and cancelling claim 67.